

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. By this Response, claims 1-9 and 12 are amended, claim 13 is added, the figures are corrected and a new abstract is attached. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above-amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication of claims 2-6 as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants note that the specification has been amended to correct for minor errors. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Office Action objects to Figs. 1-4 alleging that they should be labeled as "PRIOR ART". In response, applicants have labeled Figs. 1-4 as "CONVENTIONAL ART" which is how they are described in the specification.

The Office Action also states that the line on the right side of each of the figures interferes with some of the figure drawings and text and should be removed. In response, applicants have removed the line on the right side of the figures.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

The Office Action objects to the abstract because it does not comply with the proper abstract format. In response, applicants have attached hereto a new abstract in compliance with MPEP §608.01(b). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 12 as being an improper multiple dependent claim and under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In response, applicants have amended claim 12 into independent format to correct for the above objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,029) in view of Clemons (U.S. Patent No. 4,599,709) and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda, Clemons and further in view of Seyyedy (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,380). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action applies the teachings of Kuroda to teach the use of a memory matrix. The Office Action admits that Kuroda, however, fails to teach or suggest connecting corresponding bit lines of each segment with an associated sensing means. The Office Action alleges that Clemons makes up for this deficiency in Kuroda's teachings. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to clarify the features recited therein. Claims 1 and 12 now recite, the word lines are divided into a number of segments, each segment including and being defined by a plurality of adjoining bit lines in the matrix, each word line in a segment is differentiated based on the position of the word line within the segment, each bit line in the segment being adjoined to a separate bit line, where each bit line is connected with an associated sensing means, thus enabling simultaneous connection of all

memory cells assigned to a word line on a segment. Applicants note that added claim 13 recites similar features.

Embodiments of the present invention divide word lines into a plurality of segments. Each word line in each segment is differentiated from each other by being connected to a separate bit line. For example, each segment may contain five (5) word lines of which the first word line, second word line to the fifth word line is associated with a different bit line. Each bit line associated with each word line of each segment is connected to a separate sensing means. Thus, a simultaneous read out of all the cells for each word line segment can be achieved.

Contrary to the claimed invention, Clemons teaches the arrangement of transistors  $T_{200} - T_{203}$  provided in one block of bits lines and transistors  $T_{204} - T_{207}$  provided in a separate block of bit lines. All of the transistors are connected together such that a single bite block decoder can access all the transistors simultaneously for a given bite block. See column 4, lines 45-60. Clemons does not teach or suggest connecting specifically corresponding bit lines of each bite block with an associated sensing means such that simultaneous readout of all memory cells in a word line segment is achieved. Further, Clemons teaches the same bite block decoder as receiving the signals from each bite block. Although the transistors in Clemons bite block are simultaneously accessed, they are not simultaneously readout by separate sensing means for each word and bit line cell in the word line segment as claimed by applicants. Thus, a parallel readout accomplished in the present invention, can never be accomplished in Clemons.

Thus, Clemons fails to teach or suggest the features of applicants' claimed invention, which are deficient in Kuroda.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Kuroda in combination with Clemons and/or Seyyedy fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed in combination as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 12 and 13 are in condition for allowance. Claims 1 and 12 are generic claims to the alleged species defined by claims 2-5 and claims 6-9. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the unelected species represented by claims 6-9. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 1-9, 12 and 13 in the application.

### Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 12 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 10/088,913

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

MKM/CJB:cb  
3672-0144P

Attachment(s)

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000